```
RIEMANN HYPOTHESIS "SHOT OF MERCY"
```

```
sq=Table[j,{j,10000}]
n=Select[sq,PrimeQ,(200)]
sq2=Table[k,{k,200}]
n3=sq2*-1
r=Table[k1,{k1,200}]
f=(((Pi+1)*r)*Sqrt[(-2*Pi*r)/((Pi+1)*r)])/((Sqrt[(2*Pi*r)^2+2*Pi*r/n]))
bb=lm[f]
s1cc=(((1)+bb*r*Sqrt[-1])+((0)+bb*r*Sqrt[-1]))/2
zz=-n3
zx=n
x1c1c = \sum_{zx=1}^{200} (1/zx * zx^{s1cc})
jj=Sum[1/zx*zx^s1cc,{2,541}]
u=N[jj]
k=N[x1c1c]
x1c1c2 = \sum_{zz=1}^{200} (1/zz \star zz^{s1cc})
kk=N[x1c1c2]
x1cc1=Re[x1c1c]
x1cc2=lm[x1c1c]
x1c=Re[x1c1c2]
x1c2=lm[x1c1c2]
proof3=Table[Im[ZetaZero[n]]//N,{n,200}]
zs=proof3
       \sum^{200} (1/\text{zs*zs^slcc})
x2c2=<sup>2</sup>
x2c2c=Re[x2c2]
x2c2c2=Im[x2c2]
N[%,9]
ListLinePlot[x2c2c]
ListLinePlot[x2c2c2]
bg=Mean[%]
proof2=x1c2
N[%,9]
proof=(x1cc1-x1cc2)/(x1cc1+x1cc2)
q=proof-proof2
gh1=proof3-proof2
bh=Mean[%]
lk=(bg+bh)/2
gh=(gh1+proof3)
jóia=gh-gh1
llk=x2c2c2-proof2
aa=Plot[RiemannSiegelZ[t],{t,0,200}]
bb=ListLinePlot[x2c2c2,PlotStyle->Blue]
```

cc=ListLinePlot[proof2,PlotStyle->Green] dd=ListLinePlot[gh1,PlotStyle->Blue] ee=ListLinePlot[llk,PlotStyle-> Red] Show[aa,cc,dd] Show[dd,cc] Show[dd,ee] Show[aa,bb] ParametricPlot[{x1cc2}, {x1cc2, -Pi, Pi}] proofN = x2c2c2 // N; peaks = FindPeaks[proofN]; zeros = CrossingDetect[proofN]*Range@Length@proofN // Thread[{#, 0}] & // DeleteCases[{0, 0}];

ListLinePlot[proofN, PlotRange -> All, Epilog -> {Red, Point@peaks, Blue, Point@zeros}, ImageSize -> Large] N[ZetaZero[1-100]]



In this graph the zeros of proof 2 and proof 3 coincide...proof 2 makes use of the limito f the imaginary of 2pi for a series of natural numbers from 1 to 200 and still they give zero at the same place as for the non trivial zeros of Riemann

 $\begin{array}{c} k = N[x1c1c] \\ x1c1c2 = z^{200} \\ kk = N[x1c1c2] \\ x1cc1 = Re[x1c1c] \\ x1cc2 = Im[x1c1c] \\ x1cc2 = Re[x1c1c2] \\ \end{array}$

x1c2=Im[x1c1c2] proof3=Table[Im[ZetaZero[n]]//N,{n,200}] zs=proof3 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1/zs*zs^s1cc)$ $x2c2 = z_{z_{s=1}}^{2}$ x2c2c=Re[x2c2] x2c2c2=lm[x2c2] N[%,9] ListLinePlot[x2c2c] ListLinePlot[x2c2c2] bg=Mean[%] proof2=x1c2 N[%,9] proof=(x1cc1-x1cc2)/(x1cc1+x1cc2)g=proof-proof2 gh1=proof3-proof2 bh=Mean[%] lk=(bg+bh)/2gh=(gh1+proof3)ióia=gh-gh1 Ilk=x2c2c2-proof2 aa=Plot[RiemannSiegelZ[t], {t, 0, 200}] bb=ListLinePlot[x2c2c2.PlotStyle->Blue] cc=ListLinePlot[proof2,PlotStyle->Green] dd=ListLinePlot[gh1,PlotStyle->Blue] ee=ListLinePlot[llk,PlotStyle-> Red] Show[aa.cc.dd] Show[dd,cc] Show[dd,ee] Show[aa,bb] ParametricPlot[{x1cc2}, {x1cc2, -Pi, Pi}] proofN = x2c2c2 // N;peaks = FindPeaks[proofN]; zeros = CrossingDetect[proofN]*Range@Length@proofN // Thread[{#, 0}] & // DeleteCases[{0, 0}];

ListLinePlot[proofN, PlotRange -> All, Epilog -> {Red, Point@peaks, Blue, Point@zeros}, ImageSize -> Large] N[ZetaZero[1-100]]



If that is not enough then consider the graph of the x2c2c2 formula tha considers the value of the limito f the derivative of the imaginary in the exponente when compared to the graph of that same function with the values of the non trivial zeros, the graphs completely overlap and totals to a difference of zero as seing in Ilk. Meaning that the derivative of the imaginary applied to the exponent of the sum of the zeta function for regular natural numbers and the non trivial zeros of Riemann , are the same value that express the tendency of the numbers to the imaginary to be the same.